KAMI EFI Kementerian PPN/ Bappenas Funded by the European Union

Sustainable Jurisdictions Indicators Working Group

2nd Traceability Consultation

Minutes of Meeting

Day/date:	Thursday April 6, 2023
Time:	14:00 – 18:00 Jakarta Time
Venue:	Ashley Hotel, Jakarta
Moderator:	Pak Rully Amrullah (EFI)
Participants:	See Annex 1

Agenda

Time	Description	Organisation
Session 1 - Opening		
14:00 - 14:15	Welcome remarks	Bappenas
Session 2 – Traceability challenges and potential solutions		
14:15 - 14:30	Palm oil supply chain traceability challenges	EFI-KAMI
14:30 - 14:45	Palm oil certification in Indonesia and the EUDR	EFI-KAMI
14:45 - 15:00	Proposed palm oil supply chain traceability model	Surveyor Indonesia
15:00 - 15:30	Q&A	Facilitator/EFI
15:30 - 16:00	Break	
Session 3 – Improving traceability by 2025		
16:00 - 17:30	Discussion of key actions to prepare for global markets in 2025	Facilitator/EFI
17:30	Closing	Bappenas

1 Opening remarks by Rully Amrullah

Rully thanked everyone for participating in this second traceability consultation and noted the presence of industry (GAR, Agro Astro Lestari and CARGILL), relevant Ministries, CPOPC, ISPO National Secretariat, as well as colleagues from civil society organisations.

Rully outlined the meeting objectives and agenda and noted that the meeting is a follow up to the 1st traceability consultation a month ago and will include discussion of key challenges that were raised. Today EFI will also present a preliminary comparative analysis of the extent to which information required under the EUDR is available from existing palm oil certifications and what needs to be done to prepare for global markets in 2025.

Rully informed the meeting that Pak Anang from Bappenas is on his way and that he requested the meeting to start pending his arrival.

2 Palm oil supply chain traceability challenges – Jeremy Broadhead

Jeremy Broadhead (EFI – KAMI Project Manager) outlined the meeting objectives: to review the key challenges and potential solutions regarding palm oil traceability in Indonesia based on the first consultation; to present/discuss the potential EUDR compliance of different standards (ISPO, RSPO, ISCC) and gaps to fill; and to highlight key actions in the context of the EUDR entering into force in late 2024.

Jeremy said the most important topic for discussion is what should be done to prepare for global markets in 2025, what are the steps to be taken, and what information/questions need to be communicated.

Jeremy presented a recap of the key points in the EUDR, including the objective of minimising the EU contribution to deforestation and forest degradation, the scope of commodities covered by the regulation; that products placed on the EU market will have to be deforestation free and legal under the regulation; the 31 December 2020 cut-off date for deforestation; and the strict traceability that will apply.

He outlined the information that will be required by EU operators, including on geolocation of oil palm plantations, evidence that oil palm is legal and deforestation free, and on risk related to deforestation, product mixing, and indigenous peoples' rights, etc. Relevant information collected by companies from smallholders, traders, and plantations could be complemented by information from palm oil sustainability certifications, district company registries and the SJI data platform to help EU operators to meet due diligence requirements. He noted that country benchmarking is due to be announced by the end of 2024.

Jeremy summarised key supply chain traceability challenges that were raised during the first consultation including that: supply chain traceability systems generally only exist for larger companies and smallholders are often not traceable; that mass balance supply chain models will not meet EUDR requirements unless all concerned palm oil is legal and deforestation free and segregation palm oil would also not meet EUDR requirements without full traceability to individual farms.

Jeremy also outlined further challenges, including information gaps in supply chains; challenges in efforts to map/register smallholders; challenges in segregating palm oil into legal and deforestation free and non-legal and deforestation free supply chains; challenges in incentivising to promote supply chain traceability (e.g. to encourage information sharing); data sharing issues due to commercial sensitivities; privacy concerns regarding personal info/geolocation sharing and differing forest definitions.

He noted some broad solutions, such as: developing/strengthening existing traceability systems and segregated supply chains; providing information on how much palm oil is traceable in a district; focusing efforts on the main EU-supplying districts.

3 Opening remarks - Pak Anang Noegroho

In 2019, under the framework of the Medium-term development plan 2019 – 2024 (*Rencana Pembangunan Jangka menengah* - RPJMN) the Jurisdictional Approach is described. It is not in a regulation, but it has strength as law regarding land use management. I start with this because people ask why we are doing more certification. I say no, this is in no way a form of certification and is to do with spatial planning. Moving forward I hope that spatial planning under the Sustainable Jurisdiction Indicators (SJI) will be based on principles of sustainability. This has a lot to do with food and nutrition – where is the space to grow food crops?

Together with EFI and funding from the EU we are exploring options for sustainability but also principles of good governance. The indicators can show how each jurisdiction meets sustainability criteria this will include indicators on supply chain traceability. Traceability should not be something strange to us as there is already a strong basis for traceability in the legal framework of Indonesia. In the Ministerial Decree (PERMENTAN 38/2020) – traceability is clearly captured and has been part of legal requirement that predate the EUDR.

Ibu Dr. Wahida can tell us the EU's reason for coming up with the EUDR, which is based on three principles: legality, sustainability, and traceability. This is in line with what we are asking of our industries here in Indonesia.

Indonesia's land area is approximately 190 million ha. More land is used for oil palm than any other land use in Indonesia, more than even paddy fields. It therefore makes sense to address palm oil issues – district wide and nationwide.

Let's discuss this together. Let's look at what we have and if there are gaps let's deal with them together. If we compare to Malaysia, they are more ready than us.

We are going to EU not to meet the administrators; we want to meet the thinkers. We have no way to do this other than through dialogue. I just spoke to Pak Rizal from CPOPC and he said let's collaborate (berkolaborasi) or kolabor-aksi (Collaborate in Action). We need cross fertilisation of ideas to find the best solutions for Indonesia. Today we have colleagues from PT Surveyor Indonesia presenting some solutions. They are important because they have institutional memory from SVLK days. Thank you all and let's work together.

3.1 Response from Ibu Wahida on the reason the EU developed the EUDR

It's simple, it all started in 2017 when a member of the EU Parliament brought up the issue of palm oil and links with climate change. This is because palm oil has links to deforestation, and deforestation is linked to EU's high carbon footprint that is then linked to climate change. This is based on an EU wide survey that showed that consumers in the EU do not want a big carbon footprint and does not want to be linked to global deforestation.

Initially they did ask stakeholders and producer countries for feedback – the final decisions and outcomes however did not reflect the feedback that was provided. There was also a lot of learning from the EU Timber Regulation (EUTR). The Green Deal accelerated and suddenly the whole EU has gone green. What happened is there is a major shift from the need to reduce the EU's carbon footprint, an entire green movement. We are left with so many regulations and compliance requirements and are not sure which ones we should tackle first. The UK has come up with the Environment bill and US is also looking into deforestation-free supply chains so it does seem that deforestation-free supply chains is a direction that global markets are taking.

4 Palm oil certification in Indonesia and the EUDR – Josil Murray

Josil Murray (EFI – KAMI Technical Expert) presented EFI's preliminary analysis comparing the EUDR requirements against palm oil sustainability certifications (ISPO, RSPO, ISCC and also MSPO in Malaysia). She noted that the analysis is only preliminary, and EFI will meet with ISPO, RSPO and MSPO to gain a better understanding of each scheme.

Josil said the analysis compared information required by EU operators under the EUDR with what information available from the certification schemes, and also assessed the gaps. The analysis focussed on three main areas: legality, deforestation free production, and traceability to the plot of land.

Josil noted that the key finding is that certification schemes all contain relevant information needed to carry out due diligence under the EUDR. In addition, the national schemes (ISPO and MSPO) are very useful in demonstrating legality because they are based on national laws. She further noted that regarding geolocation and deforestation free production there are large gaps. Regarding demonstration of deforestation free production, all the schemes reviewed use definitions of 'forest', which differ from the FAO-based definition used in the EUDR. Additionally, the ISPO regulation (Permen 38/2020) does not include a cut-off date. Difference in definition of 'forest' is likely to mean that even with segregated supply chain models, additional information will be needed to demonstrate deforestation free production as of 31 December 2020 as per EUDR requirements.

Regarding legality, Josil said all schemes provide information on legal production although there are gaps, e.g., for RSPO, STDB is not required although this is often the practice on the ground, even if it's not a written requirement.

Regarding geolocation, Josil said all schemes have geolocation requirements, but the main problem is that the EUDR requires polygons for >4 ha, and no standards include this.

Regarding EUDR Article 10 (risk assessment), Josil said the main issue is that traceability from the farm to the mill is often lacking because due to challenges in collecting relevant information. This also means there is a risk of mixing of palm oil from deforestation areas, which is generally higher for smallholders than larger companies due to the complexity of supply chains and number of points at which mixing can occur. Josil noted that Surveyor Indonesia will present a proposal to help address issues regarding farm to mill traceability.

5 Proposed palm oil supply chain traceability model – Pak Nata

Pak Nata (PT Surveyor Indonesia, PT SI) noted that in 2021, Pak Haris CEO of Surveyor Indonesia got a visit from Bapak Mahendra Siregar (Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs) who is currently the chairman of OJK (Financial Services Authority of Indonesia) asking for 'out of the box' solution to deal with the palm oil situation with Europe. In those early days the discussions were towards WTO but they wanted to know how to deal with the situation B2B. We need to make this work because the private sector with B2B ties with the EU will be affected. We then asked Pak Anang how we can extend this to oil palm and as the conversations evolved, EUDR moved towards full traceability.

Pak Nata explained that the Government of the Republic of Indonesia has stipulated the basis for palm oil traceability through Minister of Agriculture Regulation No. 38 of 2020 (Sustainable Palm Oil Certification). Surveyor Indonesia found that the Annex of the regulation contains detailed description for strict traceability including segregation requirements such as details on how to carry out equipment flushing. However, support is needed to ensure successful implementation of strict traceability in Indonesia.

With regards to segregation, Pak Nata explained that discussion with RSPO and ISPO revealed that at least 5% of palm oil production in Indonesia is segregated. He said that this provides a starting point for efforts to help districts and their smallholders to meet EUDR requirements, especially those not yet certified and not yet legally compliant.

Pak Nata stressed the importance of collaboration to ensure that independent smallholders are not left behind in the context of challenges faced regarding demonstration of legality, geolocation and deforestation-free production. Pak Nata noted that there are operational traceability systems in Indonesia e.g.: Siperibun, RSPO, Hamurni, Koltiva and that Surveyor Indonesia is in discussion on how these systems can be integrated with PT SI's proposed system.

With regards to information sharing concerns, Pak Nata mentioned two regarding: i) on data input from the distributor agents and collectors, and ii) data security. Pak Nata expects that the PT SI

proposed traceability system would address data security concerns through use of Satu Data Indonesia's as described in the presidential regulation.

Pak Nata presented the PT SI proposed palm oil supply chain traceability model that would support market access especially for smallholders where a 'Legal & deforestation-free declarations' - a delivery document in a form of a QR code containing information about the product (fresh fruit bunches - FFB) collected at the farm / plantation. This QR code and all the information that is contained is passed to the mill. Each batch from farm to mill has a QR code and the mills then pass information on up the supply chain until the exporter.

Legal & Deforestation free Declarations will contain information that corresponds to the EUDR due diligence information requirements:

a) **Description**, including the trade name and type of the relevant products

b) **Quantity** of the relevant product (expressed in net mass or, when applicable, volume, or number of units)

c) Identification of the **country of production**

d) **Geolocation** of all plots of land

e) **Name**, **email** and **address** of any business or person to whom the relevant products have been **supplied**;

f) Adequate conclusive and verifiable information that the relevant products are **deforestation free**;

g) Adequately conclusive and verifiable information that the production of relevant commodities has been conducted in accordance with the relevant **legislation of the country of production**

With regards to geo-location information, Pak Nata explained that polygon information will be available for each farm and the public would be able to view the location information on the interface.

Pak Nata described a 'district rating' system where plantations, mills, processing units, and all points in the palm oil supply chain will be assessed. Districts will also be assessed for deforestation risk and plantations / supply chain actors will be rated based on whether or not they are certified. An overlay of different risks will be available for each plantation.

With regards to data confidentiality and security concerns, Pak Nata said that there will be a differentiation of authorizations between users. PUSDATIN (Data and Information Centre) in Bappenas will store this data. One question that still needs to be explored is who will validate the data that is included in the system.

6 Discussion

Comment by Pak Anang Noegroho, Bappenas

Bappenas has been given the mandate to manage Satu Data Indonesia, this means we have the responsibility to make sure data is not misused. We are concerned about the EU regulation that requires sharing of information that might be considered sensitive. The 23 SJI can be used as proxies for sustainability. The high risk – low risk rating is also useful to provide an overview of the risk per jurisdiction.

Comment from Pak Agus Purnomo, GAR

Thank you for leading work that I believe is moving in the right direction.

It is still not clear what the EU needs and to some extent we still need to guess if this will be acceptable. We don't know the details – for example if the EUDR risk rating will be at the national or sub-national level. There is a possibility that the district risk rating might not be relevant. We also don't

know if the risk rating of the EU is by commodity or for all commodities. This is a concern because non-palm-linked deforestation is far more.

With regards to the use of the QR system, this is commonly used for traceability but what about block chain? Palm oil changes form faster than any other commodity. For example, wood is easier to track / trace because it doesn't change form for most products. But FFB changes to liquid and then it is aggregated and therefore not possible to segregate. At most we could perhaps say that a particular batch meets the EUDR requirements. But the cost associated with that claim is technically and physically challenging and expensive. How much more is the EU willing to pay for such claims?

Further clarification is needed on the minimum palm oil content in a product – for example, margarine and soap's palm oil content is small, and clarification is needed as to whether such products need to comply. With regards to the QR code: how many millions of QR do we need based on the sheer volume of palm oil that we produce?

For me all these are technical challenge that still need negotiation with the EU. More importantly, I am concerned about the EU's capacity to implement the regulation. Indonesia can comply with the regulation, but the EU is the one that would not have the capacity to carry out checks. The millions of QR generated would not help the situation.

With regards to the jurisdictional approach, ideally it should extend to all commodities in a jurisdiction, not just palm oil. The challenge would be as to what happens when you have one commodity that is more advanced and how that would affect the rating of the district.

Comment from Ibu Rhea Sianipar, Cargill

The industry's main concern is about mapping smallholders and the gaps in the certification schemes. Industry has systems in place to meet EUDR requirements for the downstream segment of the supply chain. It is the upstream that we are concerned about especially for independent smallholders. We are interested in the implementation roadmap, and we want to know how industry can support the implementation of the QR code system proposed by PT SI.

Comment from Ino Safaat, Executive Director PisAGRO

Thank you for the invitation, Pak Anang and EFI. I found the comparative analysis very interesting especially using EUDR as a starting point. The presentation is clear and the gaps are clear. We need to work on these gaps, some we can address but others are more challenging. The [forest] definition issue is the most glaring one that needs to be address as it has wider implications.

The message we are getting from the EU is that they are not clear on their own direction. What we are certain about is that they want to reduce the amount of palm oil they consume and that is their main objective regarding the EUDR. In the end, we need to decide if we want to follow EU's requirements, or do we want to stand firm to say that we are sustainable and have mechanisms to prove this. Palm oil is ahead of other commodities with regards to legal and sustainability compliance. Palm oil is in a good position compared to other commodities.

Traceability is a concern and there is a lot of technology out there to support traceability, with pros and cons. Sinarmas for example can trace >90% of their production. However, we are not sure if we implement all these traceability requirements, will the EU accept it?

Comment from Rukaiyah Rafiq, **Fortasbi**

I am not speaking on behalf of farmers but my parents are farmers so I can share from that perspective. I appreciate this initiative. For big companies traceability is not an issue; their area is fixed and if you add to your area, you have clear permits to refer to. The big challenge is for independent smallholders. Farmers are simple people, they need only two things – a fixed market and payment.

With regards to the EU's requirements, we need to consider one thing. If we want to support traceability, we need to have trading systems (*tata niaga*) that force mills to buy from farmers and that helps farmers, or they will go out of the district to sell, which is an issue for tracing to the farm.

With regards to certification, smallholders like the book and claim system because they get clear and direct incentives (payment). But this might not be good for the industry because they cannot sell certified FFB even if they are fully certified. I want to stress that identity preserved (IP) and segregated (SG) palm oil supply chain models have a role to regulate this as it forces the systems to support smallholders.

Last year, Fortasbi supported 15,000 farmers to get credits and 430 USD/tonne was the highest we managed to secure. FFBs from these farms have no issues entering IP and SG mills but can they get the same return? It is a pity that their certified FFB cannot be put into IP and SG models. If they sold these FFB to GAR for example, these could only enter the mass balance (MB) supply chain model even if they are fully certified.

I have feedback on the comparative analysis - please look at the RSPO national interpretation for the assessment of STDB, as it is listed as a legality requirement. Furthermore, continuous RSPO improvement requirements would mean that if an auditor found that a farmer did not have the STDB, he/she will require for this to be present in the surveillance audit.

With regards to the risk of mixing, note that RSPO MB would qualify for EUDR because even the uncertified component must be legal and geolocated. (Note from EFI: current rules do not require the non-certified component to be deforestation free).

Comment from Ibu Pungki, Fortasbi

There is a lot of effort needed for smallholders to meet the standards but how can traceability be used to increase their capacity to be sustainable?

One weakness of the EUDR is the geolocation requirement. Yes, it is available and required for all schemes but hard for farmers to provide. My understanding is that the requirement for polygon information for plots of land >4ha is just to demonstrate that the area was not forest but based on our experience, we can tell that even 2 ha farms can still be in *Kawasan Hutan*/forest zone.

My feedback is that the EU needs to be consistent. If polygon information is need then everyone needs to have it if not there will be implementation issues. On Indonesia's side, make the requirement for polygon information mandatory for all regardless of size and link this to license requirements e.g.: STDB.

Comment from Pak Herdrajat, ISPO

I have a comment about smallholder traceability - if you overlay farm areas you will find that many are in *Kawasan Hutan*/forest zone and many have certificates.

With regard to the gap assessment, please give us time to also do our gap analysis then we can compare notes. We know this information is needed soon, definitely before the end of May.

Let me share some preliminary feedback, ISPO has a cut-off date: 2018. We could review the ISPO principles to check when the presidential instruction (IMPRES) was issued and follow that cut-off date.

With regards to ISPO group certification, a group can be certified even if there are members who are located in *Kawasan Hutan*/forest zone. If there is an overlap then we need to find the best solution for such cases.

We welcome Bappenas engagement in the palm oil sector. This link to markets is important because at the moment, ISPO is not accepted in the market because we don't have an on-product label. The Ministry of Industry is not responsible for ISPO and that's why the uptake is slow as there is not a link to the markets.

Based on the presentation I understand that the EU asking for segregation but what about mass balance?

That's all for now, it would have been more helpful if we know what your evaluation criteria were so we can tell you where to look in the standard or if ISPO meets the requirements.

Comment from Pak Irfan, WWF-Indonesia

A few comments on the comparative analysis:

With regards to the ISPO cut-off date, it's not explicit but the PIPPIB (Peta Indikatif Penghentian Pemberian Izin Baru Hutan Alam Primer Dan Lahan Gambut/Indicative Map for Termination of Issuing New Permits for Primary Natural Forest and Peatland) 2018 was adopted by the ISPO Standard and this is used as the 'no-deforestation cut-off date'.

In a presentation Henriette had mentioned that ISPO has no deforestation requirements – this is not correct, perhaps Pak Anang could explain better.

With regards to AMDAL/Environmental Impact Assessment requirements for smallholders, note there is a special AMDAL for smallholders.

The problem is with traceability to the plot of land. STDB has requirements for polygon information to be provided. Let's all use polygon as the minimum requirement for geolocation in Indonesia then STDB could be used as the national requirement for geolocation.

With regards to segregation – if we learn from SVLK and SILK and use it as a benchmark, then the success of SILK's traceability is based on the use of an exit permit. Anyone who want to trade needs SVLK not just for export to the EU but to trade timber. Palm oil should consider this as an option. Don't just limit the QR code or system to EU, make it mandatory for the whole country for all trade, exports and as a B2B tool. Then segregation will not be needed since the whole supply chain is covered by the minimum requirements.

With regards to the EU and the EUDR requirements, it is below sustainability requirements. Not sure if this can be done or not but why can't RSPO certification or ISPO be accepted. Are the competent authorities ready to check all the different due diligence statements?

The palm oil industry is moving towards sustainability, EUDR or not, and we need to move that direction. The EU is buying less than 10% of Indonesian palm oil but if the traceability system can strengthen ISPO then that would be valuable for Indonesia.

Comment from Ibu Josi, **USAID SEGAR**

I am coming from the jurisdictional approach, but the EUDR puts a lot of focus on traceability to the plot of land which will have a big impact on smallholders. Full traceability can only be achieved by big plantation companies and independent smallholders will be left out and an answer to address this is the jurisdictional approach – to make sure independent smallholders are not left out.

My understanding is that EUDR is based on national risk rating, and we hope that Pak Anang can ask the EU about the role of subnational risk rating in the EUDR. Will they recognise sub-national risk rating to make sure smallholders are not excluded?

I have questions about the Global Market Indicators – what is the EU's take on this? What is the relationship with the Sustainable Jurisdictions Indicators/SJI?

If the palm oil sector is struggling with traceability, what about other commodities? The jurisdictional approach is a way to make sure that at least we can trace back to the jurisdiction. Indonesia is a decentralised country and monitoring and regulating at the district level is possible.

Comment from Ibu Silfi, GIZ

GIZ is working on traceability for rubber in West Kalimantan and cocoa in Sulawesi and in West Kalimantan we can trace all the way to the farm.

Comment from Pak Taufic Nugraha, GIZ

In East Kalimantan we work closely with DSM palm oil company and have 4000 independent smallholders certified under ISPO and RSPO. We achieved such scale using joint certification which is cheaper and more practical for farmers.

Comment from Pak Adang, Proforest

Proforest works a lot on traceability and in Indonesia we work with Daemeter on the 'Risk Calibrated Approach for Traceability to the Plantation'. Risk is assessed based on the area within a 50km radius of the mill. This is a different risk assessment from on based on the jurisdictional approach and 50 km could cross jurisdictions.

Comment from Pak Panji Anom, Javlec

We are testing out the application of the jurisdictional approach in one district and learned about issues related to traceability especially difficulties faced by indigenous people and transmigrants.

Legality does not appear to be an issue as this is based on ISPO / RSPO requirements. The question is how we can trace FFBs to the mills. We can trace but never 100%. We know that FFB from *Kawasan Hutan*/forest zone are mixed with FFB from legal areas. My question is how can traceability tools address such mixing?

Pak Nata, PT SI feedback to the questions / comments

Pak Nata explained that there is an operator training for supply chain segregation called the batching system that teaches how to physically segregate sustainable and non-sustainable batches during processing and how to do associated bookkeeping. He further explained the kind of information that will be associated with the QR code, showing how it is possible to differentiate what is legal and deforestation free palm oil from other palm oil.

Pak Nata presented PT SI's analysis on palm oil linked deforestation after 2020 for each district and noted that the risk rating can be used to show the EU about the risk of deforestation related products coming from a district. Bappenas is also interested to assess how risk ratings could support funding decisions or support sustainability improvements in district, e.g., support could promote districts to achieve low deforestation, high certification, and low oil palm expansion. As for producers in the districts, the location of the farms coupled with relevant information on deforestation-free and legal status could help give them access to buyers.

The next step is to support the mapping out for all districts of the three basic EUDR requirements – legality, deforestation-free, traceable - in support of smallholders to make sure they can access markets without having to go through certification.

Jeremy Broadhead, feedback to the questions / comments

In response to the questions about Global Market Indicators and the relationship with Sustainable Jurisdictions Indicators/SJI, Jeremy noted that a set of 'Global Market Indicators' will be proposed by the University of Indonesia for consideration by palm oil stakeholders and Pak Anang, and the relationship to the Sustainable Jurisdictions Indicators would also be according to the decision of Bappenas and relevant stakeholders.

7 Closing remark from Pak Anang

Pak Anang asked all participants to consider what was discussed today. The SJI will proceed as a national initiative not because of the EU or EUDR. If it can help compliance with the EUDR that is a bonus.

Our reason to go to the EU is to create dialogue and build relationships and it's a long process. Let's keep the dialogue flowing with the EU.

Pak Anang stressed that sustainability is a national agenda for Indonesia. Bappenas has two mandates:

- Sectoral coordination, evaluation and funding of development
- Develop a national model for the agriculture sector thar includes palm oil

According to Pak Anang, the agriculture industry in Indonesia is wide, today we discussed palm oil and there are many stakeholders that support the sector but what about other commodities?

Pak Anang informed the meeting that Bappenas is preparing the RPJMN (national medium-term development plan) for 2024-2029 which has to be completed by May.

Pak Anang ended by reminding participants that we are part of the big change.

***

Meeting minutes prepared by EFI.

21 April 2023.

Annex 1: List of participants

No	Name	Gender	Institution
1	Anang Noegroho	M	Bappenas
2	Rizal Lukman	M	Council Of Palm Oil Producing Countries (CPOPC)
3	Saras Ayliarahma	F	Council Of Palm Oil Producing Countries (CPOPC)
4	Puah Chiew Wei	F	Council Of Palm Oil Producing Countries (CPOPC)
5	Rismansyah	M	ISPO National Secretariat
6	Heriyadi	M	ISPO National Secretariat
7	Herdrajat	M	ISPO national Secretariat
8	Mahardhika	M	Ministry of Home Affairs PEIPD/ Directorate of Regional Development Planning, Evaluation and Information
9	Jaka Ramdani	M	Ministry of Home Affairs PEIPD/ Directorate of Regional Development Planning, Evaluation and Information
10	Arifin Ma'ruf	M	Javlec
11	Andra Andrian Hidayat	M	Javlec
12	Panji Anom	M	Javlec
13	Mukhlis Sai	M	Javlec
14	Silfi Iriyani	F	GIZ Safe Project
15	Taufik Nugraha	M	GIZ
16	Rukaiya Rafik	F	Fortasbi
17	Sendy T. N	F	Fortasbi
18	Josi Khatarina	F	USAID Segar
19	Hidayatullah	M	USAID Segar
20	Martinus Nata	M	Surveyor Indonesia
21	Erwin Widodo	M	Surveyor Indonesia
22	Dewi Febriyanti	F	Surveyor Indonesia
23	Satria Gundara	M	Surveyor Indonesia
24	Eko Setiawan	M	HARA
25	Fernando Sirait	M	HARA
26	Ino Syafaat	M	PisAgro
27	Hendry M	M	PisAgro
28	Ferron Haryanto	M	PisAgro
29	A Fajar Surahman	M	Agro Astro Lestari
30	Amrizal Yusri	M	Agro Astro Lestari
31	M Nur Ghiffari	F	LPEM UI
32	Rhea Sianipar	F	CARGILL
33	Irfan Bahtiar	M	WWF Indonesia
34	Ibrahim	M	Proforest
35	Mila Nuh	F	Proforest
36	Agus Purnomo	M	GAR
37	Jeremy Broadhead	M	EFI
38	Rully Amrullah	M	EFI
39	Josil Murray	F	EFI
Online			

40	Guntur Prabowo	M	RSPO
41	Irene Fischbach	F	RSPO
42	Su Ming Chuah	F	RSPO
43	Christine Cullen	F	EFI
44	Thomas Sembres	M	EFI
45	Angelia Pardede	F	Ministry of Trade
46	Atik Hartati	F	Ministry of Trade
47	Anton Sanjaya	M	KEHATI